

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-17 are now pending in the application with Claim 15 being cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Claims 1, 12 and 17 which have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomoyoshi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,947,426 to Kraus. In view of the arguments and amendments herein, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to independent Claim 1 which includes the limitation that the receivers are formed by a pair of partitions (4, 4') and that these partitions are displaced relative to each other by the elbow. The previous Office Action shows and describes the retaining clip by Kraus. In this regard, the Office Action states that Kraus teaches an elbow defined between the two latching fingers.

While Applicant does not agree with the characterization, amendments have been made to the claims to further prosecution. Applicant respectfully submits that the Kraus reference teaches a single projection as opposed to a pair of projections.

Further, the Kraus reference does not teach that the projections are offset with respect to each other and separated by an elbow as is now claimed in Claim 1 and its dependents. As such, Claims 1, 2 and Claims 4-11 are believed to be distinguished from the references and in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 12 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 15. Therefore, Claims 12-14 and 16-17 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

Aug 10-2005

By: _____

Ch A Eusebi

Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb